



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE RESURRECTION IN PRIMITIVE TRADITION AND OBSERVANCE

---

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON  
Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

---

It is generally recognized among critical students of the New Testament that that form of the Resurrection narrative which, through the preponderant influence of Mark in records of fact, has become fundamental to the gospels must be admitted to be secondary, and even relatively late, as compared to the form exhibited in the brief recapitulation of the common and accepted tradition made by Paul in I Cor. 15:3-8.

The contrast is striking. Paul expressly states in I Cor. 15:11 that the tradition which he summarizes is that not of a part, but of the whole church. It is the common tradition, and yet in a sense deserves to be called Petrine, because in it the foundation of everything is the manifestation "to Cephas." Paul's visit to "Cephas" only three years after his own conversion<sup>1</sup> places its authenticity beyond cavil or dispute. But in this tradition the experiences of the women and others in the vicinity of the sepulcher are totally ignored. In the story of Mark, variously modified in Matthew, Luke, and John, on the other hand, the sepulcher stories are fundamental; whereas, the manifestation "to Cephas" has left but a few half-obliterated traces, as alien as erratic blocks to the context wherein they stand.

To this historico-critical problem the present writer believes it possible to apply a method which, if not altogether new in principle, is at least new in mode and measure of application, and may prove fruitful of important and trustworthy results. This method is already applied to the Gospel of Mark in the volume entitled *Beginnings of Gospel Story*.<sup>2</sup> In a subsequent article entitled "The Purpose of Mark's Gospel"<sup>3</sup> I endeavored to set

<sup>1</sup> Gal. 1:18.

<sup>2</sup> Yale University Press, 1909.

<sup>3</sup> *Jour. of Bibl. Lit.*, XXIX (1910).

forth the principle of what I have ventured to designate the "Method of Pragmatic Values," and I am glad to say that it has since won the hearty endorsement of Professor Harnack of Berlin.<sup>4</sup> The method proposed rests upon the principle that the evangelic writings were compiled not so much for historical as for apologetic and aetiological purposes, and that their contents must consequently be studied in the light of the beliefs and practises their authors, and the authors and expounders of the traditional material they embody and apply, were aiming to explain and defend. We must go to the sources which exhibit the actual usages and beliefs of the primitive church, as it were in action—we must go primarily to the Pauline epistles, to understand why the church preserved just what it did preserve of primitive story, and why its present form is what it is.

Among other illustrations of the evidences afforded in Mark, the oldest of our gospels, of the effects of the adaptation of the tradition to local usage, I instanced particularly the notorious discord between synoptic and Johannine tradition regarding the dates of the final tragedy with relation to the Passover. Mark and its satellites determine chronologically with great care certain crises of the story; and these are found to correspond to certain known observances of the Roman church in its commemoration of Jesus' death and resurrection, which we may call hebdomadal because, however heightened at the appropriate season of the year, it was fundamentally an observance of certain days of the *week*. The Fourth Gospel, on the contrary, which is certainly oriental in origin, is found in its dating of events with relation to the (lunar) month, to conform to oriental practice. This practice was called "Quartodeciman" because it commemorated the death and resurrection of Jesus *annually* on a single day identical with the Passover day of the Jews. This day was always the fourteenth of Nisan, or the full-moon of the first month, irrespective of the incidence of the day of the week, though regard was also paid to certain days of the week at all seasons. Certain sects of Quartodecimans, it is true, notably one in Cappadocia, had so far broken

<sup>4</sup> In a private communication Professor Harnack writes regarding this article, "Sie haben in ihr einen Gedanken zum Leitstern gemacht der gewiss richtig ist."

away from Jewish usage as to employ for their observance of the resurrection the Roman vernal equinox (March 25), just as we employ the Roman winter solstice (December 25) for the celebration of the complementary mystery of the incarnation. This solar date was more convenient and more acceptable than a lunar date because for the determination of the latter the church would be dependent on the hated Synagogue. On the essential point, however, viz., denial of the Roman hebdomadal system, which contended that it was not proper "to terminate the fast on any other than the Lord's day," the Cappadocians were in agreement with other Quartodecimans,<sup>5</sup> and with Asiatic practice generally. They disregarded the day of the week in their annual celebration of "the mystery of the Lord's resurrection,"<sup>6</sup> and this practice was stoutly maintained as an unbroken tradition since the time of the apostles themselves. It can scarcely be doubted that the divergence of East and West on this point dates from well within the first century.

I shall not repeat here the arguments adduced in my volume entitled *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*,<sup>7</sup> in the chapter headed "Johannine Quartodecimanism," to prove that the datings of the Fourth Gospel correspond with its Asiatic derivation. Not only the three great feasts, Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, are all distinguished in this gospel by visits of Jesus to Jerusalem at which both discourse and action are suited to the occasion, but Unleavened Bread and Dedication come in as well. This gospel dates the anointing in Bethany "six days before the Passover" (not "two days" as in Mark), because the tenth Nisan (*six* days, according to ancient reckoning, before Nisan 15, the "great day" of the feast) was the day set in Exod. 12:3 ff. for the choosing and setting apart of the lamb. Epiphanius explicitly informs us that Quartodecimans observed this day in memory of Christ's being set apart and designated our Passover.<sup>8</sup> Instances need not be multiplied, as

<sup>5</sup> A sub-group referred to by Preuschen in the article hereinafter cited kept April 7. The equation followed is easily perceived. March 25 (Julian equinox) = Nisan 1 (Jewish New Year's Day). Hence Nisan 14 (Passover) = April 7.

<sup>6</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xxiii. 1, 2.

<sup>7</sup> Moffat, Yard & Co., New York, 1910.

<sup>8</sup> "We take the sheep from the tenth day, recognizing the name of Jesus on account of the iota" (*Haer.* 1. 3).

everyone knows the Fourth Gospel exhibits a tacit but very patent correction of the Markan date for the crucifixion, so that Jesus' death in it coincides even to the hour with the slaughtering of the Passover lambs. Jesus instead of celebrating the Passover with his disciples, joins with them in a last supper which is not a passover meal at all, and whose distinctive rite formally instituted in perpetuity is—foot-washing! In fact, the whole institution of the sacrament is transferred by the fourth evangelist to the Passover of the preceding year, on occasion of the miracle of the Loaves in Galilee. For the significance of all this extraordinary divergence of the Johannine from synoptic tradition I must content myself here with a bare reference to the volumes cited, merely recalling the evidence adduced from the narrative of Mark itself that the discrepancy is due to the Roman, not to the Asiatic writer. The Markan narrative has been changed for the purpose of adapting its form of the story to Western observance and the hebdomadal system, and Matthew and Luke have followed suit. Sufficient traces remain, however, in all three Synoptics to prove that in its precanonical form this narrative agreed with the Johannine and with the immemorial practice of the churches of the East with respect to the date of Jesus' death. The crucifixion *did* take place, as the conspirators planned it should, "before the feast" with its attendant danger of "a tumult of the people." On this point, as well as on the probable motive for the change, I am glad to cite the emphatic endorsement of two such eminent authorities as Burkitt at Cambridge,<sup>9</sup> and Loisy in Paris.<sup>10</sup> Mark's narrative still plainly shows the effects of a recasting in the interest of the hebdomadal system of the western churches. Every element in the redactor's dating of what we still call "Passion Week" is determined by the pivotal Lord's Day after Passover. The crucifixion fast-day (cf. the proleptic reference in 2:20) is exactly subdivided into its four watches of three hours each: from dawn till 9 A.M. the trial and mockery; from 9 till 12 crucifixion; from 12 till 3 P.M. darkness; at 3 P.M. the expiring cry; at sunset the burial. So with the preceding two days. The second day before

<sup>9</sup> *Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, 1910, p. 93 f.

<sup>10</sup> *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, I, 4 (1910), p. 375.

the Passover (Mk. 14:1) is the day of the Anointing. The day before the Passover (14:12) is that of the Preparation. "At evening" (14:17), the legal date for the Passover Supper, we have the institution of the Eucharist; thereafter the night of watching in Gethsemane, corresponding to the Passover "night of watching unto Yahweh" (Exod. 13:42), an observance perpetuated in the Easter vigil of the primitive Church. Perhaps the evangelist even intends to mark the close of each watch before the last in this night of vigil by the three-fold coming of Jesus to rouse the sleeping disciples. This is open to doubt. It cannot possibly be accidental, however, that when we bring the narrative thus minutely dated—and be it remembered that no other gospel narratives are dated at all save these pertaining to the death and resurrection—into comparison with the known observances by which the early church commemorated the great tragedy of Redemption, they are found to be in exact chronological coincidence. Moreover, in the synoptic tradition, the Western, or hebdomadal system, in which the first day of the week as commemorating the resurrection is pivotal, has progressively and almost completely triumphed over the luni-solar, or annual, in which the pivotal date is the annual Passover of the new Redemption. For Quartodecimans observed only a single day, coincident with "that on which the people (of the Jews) put away the leaven," i.e., Nisan 14. This was to them the day in which the Redeemer "through death overcame him that had the power of Death, and liberated us who through fear of Death were all our life-time subject to bondage."<sup>11</sup>

A recapitulation of these facts already established regarding the recasting in the synoptic record of the ancient Petrine story of Calvary to conform to Western ritual was necessary as a preliminary to the further question whether and to what extent the more fundamental disagreement of the records regarding the resurrection were involved in this process.

As already stated there still remain in Mark many traces that the Western or hebdomadal system of commemoration of the resurrection has been forced upon the older Petrine narrative. For most of these traces I must refer to the volume already cited.

<sup>11</sup> Heb. 2:15.

One I will recall. Notoriously the Gospel of Mark has suffered mutilation at the end, and that almost certainly at a date anterior to its employment by Matthew and Luke. The account of the "manifestation to Cephas" implied in Mark 14:28 and 16:7 as about to take place "in Galilee," a manifestation both foretold in Luke 22:32 and subsequently referred to in Luke 22:34, has disappeared. We can indeed reconstruct it with considerable confidence from the fragmentary end of the *Gospel of Peter*, in combination with the chapter appended to the Gospel of John. According to these authorities Peter and his companions remained in hiding in Jerusalem, paralyzed with fear and grief, *until the seven days of the feast* (Passover and Unleavened Bread) *were over*.<sup>12</sup> Then a smaller group, Peter at the head, returned heartbroken to their fishing at the Lake of Galilee. It was there, *some ten days at least after the crucifixion*, that "the Lord appeared unto Simon" and he "turned again and rallied his brethren."<sup>13</sup> This earlier form of the narrative, a form surely guaranteed by the statement of Paul, is absolutely unaffected by that whose cardinal point is the discovery of the empty tomb "on the third day." Paul refers indeed to "the third day," but his chronology, as we shall see, has no relation to the hebdomadal system, and his tradition takes no cognizance whatever of any of the group of Sepulcher stories. His statement that Jesus rose "on the third day" is not even based upon any of these, but explicitly upon "Scripture." Just what is here implied we must inquire hereafter. The expression "the third day" may have affected our form of the Sepulcher traditions; it certainly has not been itself affected by them. For the Synop- tists themselves have not yet fully adjusted this "third-day" date to their chronology. The practical difficulties of bringing in so early an appearance to Peter "in Galilee" are in fact almost insuperable. Luke, as we know, overcomes them by excluding the flight to Galilee altogether; but with such obvious violence to his sources as to leave no choice on the point of originality. And this fundamental date itself is vacillating. In Mark we still have uniformly "after three days," a phrase corresponding to the Jonah

<sup>12</sup> *Ev. Petri* vii. 26 f., xiv. 58 f.; Preuschen, *Antileg.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ev. Petri* xiv. 58 to end.

prophecy applied to the Resurrection in Mark 12:40, and to certain forms of observance in the resurrection cults, but so manifestly discordant with the story, that the dependent gospels change to "the third day,"<sup>14</sup> while other primitive documents make curious and ingenious attempts at harmonization.<sup>15</sup>

Nor is this by any means the only evidence of the secondary and relatively late origin of the synoptic as against the Pauline tradition. In Mark, its earliest form, it winds up with a statement calculated to obviate the objection inevitably suggested by the parallel tradition that the disciples departed some four days later to Galilee, still "weeping and mourning."<sup>16</sup> The women, we are told, "said nothing to any man because they were afraid." Without some such explanation the Markan story could not have found room alongside that of the apostolic manifestations. Later forms of the story introduce various devices to account for the lack of communication between the women and the disciples. Matthew, among other readjustments, introduces *two* parallel explanations: (1) The women *did* carry the message (28:8); (2) Jesus himself by special intervention prevented its miscarriage (28:9 f.). Still, however, the manifestations to the eleven are "in Galilee." According to Luke the Twelve were indeed told, they even verified the women's account to the extent of investigating the tomb, but they "disbelieved." This leaves room for independent manifestations to the eleven. The needless removal to Galilee is cancelled. The fourth evangelist reduces the number of those who receive the message to two, and attributes the disbelief only to Peter. The Beloved Disciple "saw and believed"; but he, too, like the women, "said nothing to any man," which is the more surprising because it does not appear that he "was afraid." After this treatment of the harmonized tradition of Luke 24:12, 22-24, the fourth evangelist adds a development of the equally secondary elements of Matt. 28:9 f. and 17, dominated as they are by a different harmonistic theory. The motives of message and disbelief are thus repeated in John 20:11-29. A

<sup>14</sup> In one instance (Matt. 27:64) our first evangelist fails to make the change.

<sup>15</sup> See below p. 387.

<sup>16</sup> *Ev. Petri* vii. 26 f.; xiv. 59.



still later hand in an appendix (chap. 21) reannexes the Galilean appearances excluded by John 20:20-23.

The interaction of the two conflicting forms of the resurrection tradition has thus left its indelible traces in the gospels themselves. The question for us to consider is whether the method of pragmatic values cannot throw some light upon this most astonishing of all the contradictions of primitive church tradition. We have seen that no narratives are so intimately bound up with primitive ritual observance as those of Mark. No observances of the primitive church are more copiously or surely attested than the two which commemorate the great events these chapters relate. In the East we have Quartodeciman observance of "the true Passover of the Lord," an *annual* celebration of a single night and day, regardless of its weekly incidence; in the West we find a *weekly* celebration of the "first day of the week," heightened at the Passover season (at least in later times) into an annual commemoration. Is it not possible to determine which of these two modes of commemoration is primitive, and which derived? I believe that it surely is, and that we shall find the comparison to throw a welcome, though probably very unexpected, light upon the problem of the origins of the church and the true significance of its early observance of "the first day of the week" as "the Lord's day."

At the outset I find the substance of my convictions ably set forth by so eminent a scholar as E. Preuschen, while I am at the same time compelled to withhold assent from certain statements which seem to me to exaggerate the facts. Preuschen thus explains the "Easter"-controversy in his article *s.v.* in the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia* (Vol. IV, 1910):

Eusebius says that it was decided on the basis of numerous conferences of bishops that the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord from the dead should be celebrated on no other day than on the Lord's day, and on that day the Easter fast should be broken (*H.E.* V. xxiii. 2). Hence it is evident that the party who were opposed in the conferences, who were undoubtedly the Christians of Asia Minor, must have celebrated the mystery of the resurrection on the day on which the fast was broken, and that this day was not Sunday but the 14th of Nisan, around which the controversy revolved. This conclusion is justified by the account of Epiphanius concerning the Quarto-

decimans . . . in which he relates that fasting and the celebration of the resurrection took place on the same day. It is hardly conceivable that a bitter and protracted controversy should have originated on a mere matter of fasting; the real reason for the differences lay deeper. The Christians of Asia Minor appealed to an old apostolic tradition according to which Jesus rose on the evening of the day of his death, and the opposition of the Occidentals was directed mainly against the commemoration of death and resurrection on the same day.

With most of this statement I find myself in complete accord. Had earlier writers on Quartodecimanism expressed themselves as clearly and accurately, much useless controversy and much darkening of counsel on the Johannine problem might have been spared us. It is not exact, however, to say that the Asiatics "appealed to an old apostolic tradition according to which *Jesus rose on the evening of the day of his death*." On the contrary, ignorance as to the precise time when Jesus "rose" was freely acknowledged by Quartodecimans in many regions. We need only cite from Drummond's admirable discussion of "The Paschal Controversy" in his *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*:<sup>17</sup>

That the fast terminated, at the latest, very early on Easter morning we know from express testimony. The first part of a letter addressed by Dionysius of Alexandria to his "beloved son and brother Basilides" relates to this question. Basilides, who, as we learn from Eusebius, was bishop of the parishes in Pentapolis, had consulted Dionysius about the hour for concluding the fast. He did so owing to a difference of opinion among the brethren, some thinking that they should do it at cock-crow, others "from the evening" (that is, the evening before Easter Sunday), the brethren in Rome, as was alleged, following the former practice, "those here" (in Egypt, or perhaps the East generally) closing the fast sooner. He was at a loss how to fix an exact hour; for while it would be "acknowledged by all alike" that they ought to begin their festivities after the time of the resurrection of our Lord, and to humble their souls with fasts up to that time, the Gospels contained no exact statement of the hour at which he rose. Dionysius in reply considers the accounts in the Gospels, and then pronounces his opinion for the guidance of those who inquire at what hour or half hour or quarter of an hour they ought "to begin the rejoicing at the resurrection of our Lord from the dead."

The reason why it was a matter of free difference of opinion and even of professed ignorance and indifference in many quarters in the East so late as the time of Dionysius at what precise hour

<sup>17</sup> P. 471.

Jesus "rose," is that it was not the Lord's "rising" in the strict sense of the word, i.e., his manifestation of himself on earth, whether at the sepulcher or elsewhere, which the earlier Asiatics celebrated in their annual festival; nor did they profess to have any special apostolic tradition on this subject. What they celebrated was not a terrestrial but a sub-terrestrial event. Their feast was the Christian counterpart of the Jewish Redemption feast. It celebrated Christ's *conquest of the power of the underworld and release of its prisoners*. It was almost as easy to connect commemoration of this kind with the various mystery cults which celebrated a similar victory of the sun-hero over Hades, and employed similar mythological symbolism, as with Jewish ritual; for vernal equinox (March 25) was celebrated in many forms of oriental religion as the anniversary of the triumph of the god of light and life, just as the Jews were holding their annual commemoration of the Redemption out of the darkness and bondage of Egypt. If we wish with Preuschen to use the word "resurrection" and its cognates to designate this event of immemorial and central significance in all the great oriental religions, we must be careful to distinguish it from the event which the occidental commemorated, and still commemorates. For the occidental employs the word "resurrection" to designate the self-manifestation of Jesus to the women and others *after his return* from the underworld. The oriental (at least in earlier times) meant by the "resurrection" the breaking of the gates of Sheol and deliverance of its prisoners. This is evidenced among other proofs by many of the newly discovered *Odes of Solomon*.<sup>18</sup> For these, whether Jewish or Christian, are true Redemption odes, in that they celebrate the victory of Yahweh's Servant (Christ?) over the gates and bars of Hades in the vein of Isa. 26:19, 27:1, Ezek. 37:1-14, and *Shemoneh Esreh* II. In fact, we can point to a progressive transition in Jewish and early Christian literature from the Hebrew figure of national restoration, often compared in the later poetry to a redemption from the power of Sheol, down to the mediaeval doctrine of the Harrowing of Hell.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> See especially Odes 17, 21, 22, 25, 28, 29, 31, 42.

<sup>19</sup> In this chain of literary remains we must not omit the "Scripture" quoted no less than five times by Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, sometimes attributing it to "Jeremiah" and sometimes to "Isaiah." "The Lord God remembered his dead people which slept in their graves and He descended to proclaim to them His own salvation."

In this transition oriental myths of the descent and victory of the sun-hero mingle with biblical imagery based on the deliverance from bondage by the smiting of the Red Sea. The oriental Christian in his celebration of what he called in distinction from the Jewish "the true passover of the Lord" was not thinking of the institution of the Lord's Supper, nor of the overcoming of the unbelief of this or that disciple by miraculous manifestations. He was thinking of the victory of his Lord over the powers of death and darkness. To him the fabled victories of demi-gods over the same powers, and the real victory of Moses in the redemption of Israel, were mere foreshadowings of this. Therefore he celebrated death and "resurrection" together. If he made any attempt to fix the exact moment of the great encounter he did not conceive it as deferred until the ensuing "Lord's day." It was on the day of the crucifixion itself, at the moment of the earthquake and rending of the rocks of Matt. 27:52. These were the visible tokens of the death-conqueror's victory, and the bursting of "the gates of Sheol." *On that same day*, therefore, "many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised and came forth out of the tombs." It is a very characteristic westernizing of this truly oriental trait in Matthew's material, when the evangelist, more anxious to avoid the indecorum of an anticipation by these "saints" of the resurrection of the Lord, than considerate of their shelterless condition during the ensuing 36 hours, postpones their entering into the city and appearing to many until "after his resurrection." The original author of the tradition thought of the "resurrection" like a true Quartodeciman. The "resurrection" day that the Quartodeciman celebrated was not the "Lord's day," nor "the first day of the week"; it was an anniversary, the anniversary of the greater Redemption. This is apparent in every line of the defense made by their great champion Apollinaris of Hierapolis:

The fourteenth [of Nisan] is the true Passover of the Lord, the great sacrifice, the Servant of God instead of the lamb, he who, himself fettered, bound the Strong Man, himself under judgment, became Judge of quick and dead. Delivered into the hands of sinners for crucifixion, exalted on the horns of the unicorn, and pierced in his holy side, he poured out from his side the two elements of purification, water and blood, word and spirit, and was buried on Passover day (14th Nisan) the stone having been laid upon his tomb.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>20</sup> *Paschal Chronicle*.

What the hard-headed occidental thought of and commemorated as the "resurrection" may well have been the re-emergence of Jesus from the rock-hewn sepulcher of Joseph of Arimathea, an event which he finally concluded must be dated "on the third day" just before dawn. In his hebdomadal system this made "the first day of the week" sacred as a memorial of the "resurrection," and his "Easter" was a mere heightening at the appropriate season of the year of the weekly festival. The oriental, on the contrary, commemorated conflict and victory in a single day annually recurrent. In the *Gospel of Peter* even the ascension is included in its span of twelve hours. His conception of the "resurrection" is voiced in the redemption songs designated the *Odes of Solomon*. The coming forth of the triumphant Redeemer is not from Joseph's tomb, but from "the gates of Sheol." Paul's statement shows that in the earliest times this "rising" was thought of as occurring—it may even, in the earliest times, have been separately celebrated—"on the third day," but it is certain that second-century Quartodecimans celebrated "a single day" in commemoration both of crucifixion and resurrection. The later divergence is explicable from the fact that it was not the "rising" so much as the bursting of "the gates of Sheol" which was commemorated. That such was the thought is already evidenced in Matt. 27:51-53. Ode 42 of the *Odes of Solomon*, speaking in the name of the Redeemer, gives dramatic expression to the scene:

I was not rejected though it appeared to be so,  
 I did not perish, though men imagined it.  
 Sheol saw me and fainted,  
 Death vomited me out and many with me.  
 I became to him gall and poison  
 I went down with him to the utmost of his depth.  
 His head and his feet became palsied;  
 For my countenance he could not endure.  
 I made a congregation of living men among his dead  
 And spoke to them with living lips,  
 That my word might not be in vain.  
 Those who had died hastened to me, and cried out and said:  
 "Have pity upon us, Son of God!  
 Do to us according to thy mercy!  
 Bring us out from the bonds of darkness,

Open the gate, that we may go out of it with thee.  
 For we see that Death has not touched thee.  
 Let us also be redeemed with thee; for thou art our Redeemer."  
 And I heard their voice, and sealed their heads with my name;  
 For they are free men, and belong unto me. Hallelujah.<sup>21</sup>

The real significance of Quartodecimanism is placed finally beyond doubt by the survivals of the practice in Gaul and Rome; for even in the West it survived so late as the sixth century! At Rome, where the death and resurrection of Attis had been officially celebrated on the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth of March, the latter being regarded as the spring equinox,<sup>22</sup> ancient Martyrologies give March 25 and March 27 as the dates of the Crucifixion and Resurrection. This doubtless rests upon the chronology of Hippolytus, who in his Paschal Table marks the Passion of Christ in 29 A.D., a date astronomically impossible, but widely accepted in the second century, and at least in Rome explicitly based (Tertullian, Augustine) on the fact that in this year Friday fell on March 25 and was coincident with the fourteenth Nisan. In his commentary on Daniel Hippolytus expressly indicates Friday, March 25, in the consulship of the two Gemini (29 A.D.) as the true date, and the Philocalien Catalogue of the Popes gives the same. Both chronologies according to Duchesne<sup>23</sup> "are derived from official documents, and may be cited as evidence of the [primitive] Roman ecclesiastical usage."

The dating of the Resurrection on March 27 is probably a mere inference from the ancient celebration of March 25 as in Cappadocia. We cannot properly infer an existing ritual observance of March 27 besides March 25 from the chronologies. Frazer gives no evidence to show that any such existed at Rome, and if in Gaul, this does not appear from the authorities cited. On the contrary the passage cited from S. Martinus Dumiensis (Migne, *Pal. Lat.* lxxii. 50) is as follows:

A plerisque Gallicanis episcopis usque ante non multum tempus custoditum est, ut semper VIII. Kal. April. diem Paschae celebrent, in quo facta Christi *resurrectio* traditur.

<sup>21</sup> Translation of J. Rendel Harris, *Odes of Solomon* (1910), 137, with emendations of Gunkel, *Zfnt.* W., XI, 4 (1910).

<sup>22</sup> Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* (1906), 199.

<sup>23</sup> *Origines du Culte Chretien*<sup>3</sup>, 262.

How curious that the very points of chief significance should have been rejected by the discoverer of this interesting testimony! It shows that Irenaeus in pleading with Victor for toleration of the "ancient" practice was speaking not for Asia only but for "observers" in his own region also. As Frazer remarks:

According to this last testimony, it was the resurrection, not the crucifixion, of Christ that was celebrated on the twenty-fifth of March; but Mgr. Duchesne attributes the statement to a mistake [!] of the writer.<sup>24</sup>

Preuschen's statement that "the Christians of Asia Minor appealed to an old apostolic tradition according to which Jesus *rose* on the evening of the day of his death" must, therefore, if accepted, be qualified by a recognition that the word "rose" is here used in a non-occidental sense.

We have still to inquire to what extent the Asiatics may justly be said to have possessed an "apostolic tradition" to this effect. Before proceeding to this, however, Preuschen's further statement of his view should be heard. He continues as follows:

The Syriac Didascalia makes an attempt to harmonize the tradition of the canonical Gospels and that of the Christians of Asia Minor. On the morning of Friday Jesus was led before Pilate and crucified on the same day. He suffered six hours and those are counted as one day. Then there was a darkness, lasting three hours, and that is counted as a night, and further, from the ninth hour until evening three hours—another day, and then followed the night of the Sabbath. In the Gospel of Matthew we read, "Now late on the Sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene," etc. (Matt. 28:1, R.V.). The calculation is strange, but its purpose is easily seen. The author believed that Jesus rose on the evening of the Friday on which he suffered death. In order to reconcile this tradition with the other which assumed a resurrection on the third day, he calculated (as above) in such a way that Jesus really rose after two days and two nights although only one day had passed. It is not known whether Friday of every week was celebrated by fasts *and the mysteries of resurrection* [!], or the 14th of each month [!], or the 14th of Nisan in each year. In the Orient Sunday was not known as the day of resurrection, *and hence there was no weekly celebration of this day* [!], but in the Occident Wednesday and Friday were regular fast days, and Sunday was celebrated as the day of resurrection. It is doubtful whether the Occident possessed in addition a special day in the year for the commemoration of the death and the resurrection of the Lord.

<sup>24</sup> I am indebted to Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., for the important data above given as to occidental Quartodecimanism from Frazer, *Adonis*, *Attis*, *Osiris*, p. 199, where references are given to the sources cited.

Of the curious evidences adduced from the *Syriac Didascalia* and Matt. 28:1 to show how the process of harmonization was applied even down to a late period to the conflicting traditions regarding "the third day" we need say but little. These, like the perplexities of Basilides of Pentapolis, are mere consequences of the impartation of the Western idea of the "rising." It was pointed out above<sup>25</sup> that the process of adjustment was still incomplete when the Gospel of Mark took its present form. Only Matthew and Luke go to the full length of logical consistency by substituting "on the third day" for Mark's "after three days." This is of minor importance, and merely confirms our previous statements regarding the slow adjustment of the "third day" datum in the synoptic tradition. In the latter part of the above extract, on the other hand, we have italicized certain statements concerning weekly and annual commemoration of the resurrection in the churches of the Orient, which at least require substantiation, if indeed they are not altogether misleading.

If we go far enough back in time it is probable that Preuschen is right in his statement of the purely hebdomadal character of occidental fasts and feasts. The addition in the West of "a special day in the year for the commemoration of the death and [another of] the resurrection of the Lord" may have been later and due to oriental influence. But nothing known to the present writer warrants the converse statement as to oriental practice. It would surely be difficult to substantiate the statement that "in the Orient there was no weekly celebration of this [the Lord's] day." On the contrary, the earliest sources that we possess for the observance of "the first day of the week" as "the Lord's day" (ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα) are distinctly oriental, including the Pauline epistles,<sup>26</sup> the contemporary "We"-document of Acts,<sup>27</sup> and the Ephesian apocalypse called the Revelation of John.<sup>28</sup> Moreover it is the *Didaché*, a document attributed by most critics to northern Syria, and almost certainly of oriental origin, which shows the Church to be still maintaining the Synagogue practice of fasting twice in the week (Luke 18:12), distinguishing its ritual from that

<sup>25</sup> P. 379.

<sup>27</sup> Acts 20:7.

<sup>26</sup> I Cor. 16:2.

<sup>28</sup> Rev. 1:10.



of "the hypocrites" (Jews) by fasting on "the fourth day of the week and the Preparation" (Friday) instead of "the second and fifth."<sup>29</sup> Such evidence as the Gospel of Mark affords<sup>30</sup> of occidental practice, early as it is, can scarcely be said to evince even an equal degree of attention to the hebdomadal system. Mark seems to know but one fast-day in the week—Friday. Lacking further evidence it can hardly then appear otherwise than a decided exaggeration to declare that in the Orient "there was no weekly celebration of this (the Lord's) day." Jewish as it was in origin, we should expect the hebdomadal system to take greater prominence among the oriental churches than among the occidental; and, so far as the present writer's knowledge extends, such is in reality the case. The true point of contrast is that whereas in the West the weekly Lord's day served as a mode of commemorating (and possibly at the very first even as the *only* mode of commemorating) the death and resurrection of Jesus, in the Orient the death and resurrection of Jesus were commemorated by the *annual* feast of the new Redemption on Nisan fourteenth, the *weekly* fasts and feast having (originally) a different occasion and application. "Fasts and celebrations of the mysteries of the resurrection" on "the fourteenth of *each month*" would seem to be nothing less than figments of Preuschen's imagination, and we have yet to hear of evidence looking to "celebration of the mysteries of the resurrection" on "*Friday* of every week." The semi-weekly fasts of *Didaché* viii, as the context itself indicates, are simply taken over from the Synagogue. Why the days were changed from "the second and fifth" to "the fourth and the Preparation" would not be hard to guess even if we had not the express statement of *Apost. Const.* v. 15, 18, and the parallel occidental phenomenon of Mark 2:20 (ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, not ἡμέραις, as in Luke, or τότε, as in Matthew). But this mere shifting of the semi-weekly fasts is a very different thing from instituting a weekly observance (on Friday!) of Jesus' death and resurrection. Why, indeed, should it be weekly? We miss the

<sup>29</sup> *Didaché* viii. In *Apost. Const.* v. 15, 18 the placing of the facts of passion week on Wednesday and Friday is said to be on account of the Betrayal and the Crucifixion.

<sup>30</sup> Mark 2:20, 16:2.

whole point of the Quartodeciman's plea in his great struggle against the overmastering domination of Roman practice, if we fail to see that in his view the commemoration of the death and resurrection of Jesus is completely independent of the hebdomadal system, and should be mainly, if not exclusively, annual.

Here, then, is the really striking and important truth of the extract we have cited. It is not true (unless all our knowledge be at fault) that in the oriental churches "there was no weekly celebration of this day" (Sunday). It is, however, true—and a truth of no small significance, that—if we go back far enough—"in the Orient Sunday was not known *as the day of resurrection*."

The final step in our problem is one which involves again the application in our exegesis of the method of pragmatic values. It calls upon us to go back in the history of the Asiatic and oriental churches and determine, as well as we are able, what ground existed for their claim in the matter of commemoration of the Lord's death and resurrection to be better representatives than the church at Rome of the true and authentic apostolic tradition. It calls upon us also to explain the prevalence in both East and West of the hebdomadal system with festal observance of "the first day of the week" as "the Lord's day." For certainly after admitting the weekly observance of this day throughout Christendom, if we deny its origin to have been what the modern world supposes, we shall be called upon to explain both its real origin and the occasion of the misapprehension.

First of all we must determine a little more exactly what sort of "old apostolic tradition" the Quartodeciman Asiatic churches really appealed to. In making his statement in the form above quoted<sup>31</sup> Preuschen doubtless does not wish to be understood as maintaining that these churches quoted definite statements attributed to the apostles "according to which Jesus rose on the evening of the day of his death." Such statements are hardly conceivable in view of the relatively uniform tradition regarding "the third day," and would certainly have provoked appeal to the definitely contrary statements of the apostle Paul in one of the best known and most widely circulated of his epistles,<sup>32</sup> to

<sup>31</sup> P. 381.

<sup>32</sup> I Cor. 15:4.

say nothing of the Gospels. We are to understand, no doubt, that the churches of Asia, mainly through Polycarp, their most venerable authority, who suffered martyrdom in 155 A.D. as "the father of the Christians of Asia" at 86 years of age,<sup>33</sup> maintained that the Quartodeciman annual commemoration of the Lord's death and resurrection, and not the Roman hebdomadal (or hebdomadal-annual), was the authentic practice of the very apostles themselves. At Rome in 154 A.D. Polycarp had in fact resisted all the attempts of Anicetus to persuade him "not to observe what he had always observed with John the disciple of our Lord, and the other apostles with whom he had associated," i.e., the annual rite on the fourteenth. As in later forms of the controversy so also at the earliest the distinction is between "observers" (*τηροῦντες*) and "non-observers." The Roman bishop makes the definite attempt to dissuade his venerable guest from a practice which he no doubt regarded as a survival of Judaism. And Irenaeus expressly testifies that Victor's predecessors before Soter back to Sixtus (115-25 A.D.) were "non-observers," though tolerant of those who observed. Irenaeus in his reference of Victor<sup>34</sup> to the observance of Polycarp "with John" has of course John the Apostle in mind. Polycarp, on the other hand, who never refers in his extant letter to John, but always to Paul, as his apostolic authority, is more likely to have had in mind John the Presbyter of Jerusalem, referred to as a leading member of the apostolic community in Palestine down to 117 A.D. by Papias, Eusebius, and Epiphanius. But this scarcely diminishes the value of his testimony. For Polycarp had been a Christian from infancy,<sup>35</sup> and had been brought to Smyrna from Syria as a youth.<sup>36</sup> He may very well, therefore, have had substantially the experience claimed, and in any event his testimony as to apostolic practice on such a point would be well-nigh conclusive. Moreover, no modern historian would question for a moment the historicity of this view of apostolic practice. It is substantially certain that at least the apostolic community in Jerusalem continued to observe the

<sup>33</sup> *Martyrdom* ix. 3.

<sup>35</sup> *Martyrdom* ix. 3.

<sup>34</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xxiv. 16.

<sup>36</sup> *Vita*, beginning.

annual rite of the Passover, however different and larger the Christian significance they probably attached to it.

But we may go farther still. The oldest and most authentic documents we possess, when studied from the viewpoint of historic ritual, make it well-nigh certain that at least in Ephesus and among the churches of Asia Quartodeciman observance was sanctioned and approved by the apostle Paul himself.

Whatever objection might be drawn from Paul's rebuke of the Galatians and Colossians for a *Judaizing and legalistic* observance of "days and months and (sacred) seasons and years"<sup>37</sup> is more than offset by his clear approval elsewhere of Christianized, non-legalistic observance<sup>38</sup> and the indisputable evidence of the "We"-document of Acts as to the keeping of "the days of Unleavened Bread" at Philippi.<sup>39</sup> But to come directly to the ancient headquarters of Quartodeciman observance, Ephesus. It is generally recognized that the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus at about the season of Passover (I Cor. 16:8) and that it contains more than one allusion to observances connected with the ritual. The exhortation, "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are unleavened; for our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ: wherefore let us keep the feast not with old leaven . . . but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth"<sup>40</sup> certainly implies sanction and approval of the keeping of a Christian Passover, and is universally recognized as alluding to the Jewish ceremony on Nisan 13 of the "putting away of the leaven." But the clew should have been followed up. Not only in chap. 5, but throughout the epistle figures recur which are suggested by the Passover ritual. That of the defiling "old leaven" returns perhaps in 15:33. "This bread," referred to in 11:26 as consecrated by Jesus and made a perpetual memorial, is the new, unleavened bread of the new (Jewish) year. The story of the redemption out of Egypt, when Israel passed through the Red Sea, a distinctively Passover theme, is employed as a figure of baptism in 10:1. But all these are merely

<sup>37</sup> Gal. 4:10; Col. 2:16.

<sup>39</sup> Acts 20:6.

<sup>38</sup> Rom. 14:5:

<sup>40</sup> I Cor. 5:7 f.

subsidiary. We are concerned with the commemoration of the resurrection, and particularly with the allusion to "the third day" as having some special significance in Christian tradition. It is vital to any historical understanding of the great resurrection chapter in I Cor., chap. 15, to realize that the entire argument, from its allusion to the fate of the seed-corn buried in the earth through the winter but raised again in the new body which God has given it at the beginning of the new year, down to its reference to Christ as the "firstfruits of them that slept," is not only suggested by, but frankly based upon, the Jewish ritual of the feast of Unleavened Bread. "Firstfruits," with its ritual of the lifting up before God of the first sheaf of the new crop marked the beginning, as Pentecost marked the close, of the seven festal weeks of wheat-harvest. It is true the phrase "on the morrow after the Sabbath" in the calendar law of Lev. 23:11, 15 was variously interpreted, orthodox Jews counting from 16th Nisan to 6th Sivan. But Samaritans and Karaites made every Firstfruits and every Pentecost a first day of the week. In the year of the crucifixion all must have been in agreement if the crucifixion was, as we have reason to believe, on Nisan 14; for Firstfruits fell of course on "the third day" from the Friday of the great tragedy. It becomes obvious at once, therefore, why Paul mentions the burial of Jesus and his rising "on the third day," however indifferent he might be to the sepulcher traditions, or ignorant of them. Jesus' burial is mentioned because it corresponds to the dropping of the kernel of wheat into the ground. His rising "on the third day" (whatever the "Scripture" on which Paul based his conviction of the fact) is affirmed because of the ritual of the ἀπαρχή; "for now is Christ risen from the dead and become the ἀπαρχή of them that slept."

We have a precisely parallel case in the passage from Clement of Alexandria excerpted no doubt from his work on the Quarto-deciman controversy by the author of the *Paschal Chronicle* (630 A.D.):

The resurrection also testifies to it (the fourteenth Nisan as the true Pass-over); at least he rose on the third day, which was the first of the weeks of the harvest, in which it had been enacted (Lev. 22:11) that the priest should offer the (wave)-sheaf.

Epiphanius, too, though opposed to the Quartodecimans, shows many traces of acquaintance with their views and practices. In his opinion (*Haer.* li. 26 f.) Jesus was crucified on the 14th Nisan and rose on the 16th, which in that year was the equinox. "It was on the 16th that the sheaf was presented at the annual festival,<sup>41</sup> and thus it prefigured the resurrection of Him who was the Firstfruits of the dead."

To Clement and Epiphanius, as to Paul, the fact (however established) that Jesus "rose on the third day" is of interest not because in the particular year of the crucifixion this happened to be a Sunday, but because it coincided with the day of the lifting of the sheaf.

But First Corinthians, written as it was from Ephesus at Passover season, is not the only Pauline epistle which testifies to primitive observance of this season among the churches of this region. Ephesians from end to end is echoing with Passover songs of redemption. Its opening paean is based upon the Redemption of a people for an "own possession." In 1:15—2:6 this theme passes over into the kindred one of deliverance from the bondage and darkness of death; in 4:8—10 it takes almost the mythological form of an avatar doctrine, employing the same scriptural passages and figures as the perhaps contemporary *Odes of Solomon*; in 5:7—14 we have the Isaian figure of Yahweh's triumph over the power of darkness and the underworld, while in 6:10—17 the armor of the conflict is (as in Isaiah) the full panoply of the sun-hero who overcomes the chaos-monster. In 5:14 we have even the explicit citation of a redemption ode of the character described and now so well exemplified, together with an encouragement in 5:18 f. to the use of such "spiritual odes" in the festal assembly. Finally, unless Origen be wrong, we have in the exhortation to "stand, having your feet shod with the readiness of the gospel of peace" (Eph. 6:14 f.) a distinct allusion to the ritual of Passover itself, which was to be eaten "with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand"<sup>42</sup>

<sup>41</sup> This is correct. See above, p. 392.

<sup>42</sup> Ex. 12:11. See the quotation from Aphraates, "And if he says: 'Eat it as men who hasten away' this is fulfilled in the church of God in this wise, that they eat the lamb 'as men who hasten away' standing on their feet," in Drummond, *Authorship*, etc., p. 461.

in "readiness" (ἐτοιμασία) to go forth from "the house of bondage."

We need not adduce further evidence of the influence of Christianized Jewish ritual upon the epistles of Paul. Enough has been set forth to make the hypothesis of influence from contemporary observance almost a certainty. To attempt in view of this an explanation of the coincidence of dates in the comparison of Jesus' crucifixion to the slaughtering of the passover lamb, and his resurrection to the lifting of the "firstfruits" of wheat-harvest as merely accidental would be irrational. It follows that Quarto-deciman commemoration of the resurrection by anniversary is not only Ephesian and "Johannine." It is Pauline. The hebdomadal system which through the Roman Gospel of Mark has become dominant in the synoptic Gospels was at least as prevalent in the East as in the West. But unlike the West the East did not base it on the events of Passion Week. Its origin then cannot have been the desire to commemorate the discovery of the empty tomb, if indeed it were a priori possible to imagine a conclave of the apostolic brotherhood inferring from this event and accompanying manifestations that the "resurrection" must have taken place on the first day of the week and enacting in consequence a weekly (why weekly?) observance of the day.

We are thus brought at last face to face with the question: What was the historic origin of the Lord's day; and how could a hebdomadal system of Synagogue origin in the East become transformed in the West into a weekly commemoration of Jesus' passion and resurrection?

We have seen above<sup>43</sup> that the transfer in *Didaché* of the semi-weekly fast-days of "the hypocrites" from "the second and fifth days of the week" to "the fourth and the Preparation" must be due to the great tragedy of Calvary. So long as the resurrection was not understood to be commemorated (or at least not primarily commemorated) by festal observance of the first day of the week as "the Lord's day," but had its own far more splendid commemoration in the annual observance of "the new Passover" on Nisan 14, the transfer would have but little effect on the resurrec-

<sup>43</sup> P. 387.

tion tradition and observance. Such were the conditions in Asia so long as the ancient Quartodeciman rite could maintain itself against the more and more intolerant anti-semitism of the West. In the West two generally prevalent tendencies brought about a quite different result. These were: (1) the substitution of more crudely concrete and external conceptions for more internal and mystical in interpreting the doctrine of the resurrection; (2) the rapid disappearance of the Jewish element from the church and simultaneous growth of an intense antipathy to practices regarded as "Judaizing," especially the observance of (Jewish) "times and seasons and days and years."

(1) We need not dwell upon the first of these tendencies. The trend of orthodox apologetic is only too apparent in the Chiliastic writers of the second century with their dogma of a "resurrection of the *flesh*" (τῆς σαρκός), and their insistence on the palpable nature of the resurrection body of Jesus,<sup>44</sup> in opposition even to the direct and explicit statements of Paul. They even insist that the Gnostics who quoted his saying "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" were perverting his meaning<sup>45</sup> and quoted Rev. 20:6 and sayings of "the Elders" in Jerusalem in proof of the material nature of the Kingdom. To believe that "when we die our souls are taken to heaven" became an intolerable heresy.<sup>46</sup> It was considered a "denial of the resurrection."<sup>47</sup> As respects the resurrection body a crudely materialistic reanimation doctrine prevailed, widely at variance with the Pauline, equally at variance, as we may perhaps infer from I Cor., chap. 15, with the primitive apostolic. Paul's doctrine posits a spiritual body wherewith we are "clothed upon," a "house from heaven," to which this earthly frame is only as the "tabernacle" to the temple. It rested upon visions of the glorified Lord. Our bodies were to be "transformed into the likeness of his glory-body." But it does not differ from the doctrine of the glorified resurrection body of *Apoc. Bar.* li. 3-11 save in the establishment of this pre-

<sup>44</sup> Luke 24:36-43; cf. Ignatius, *ad Smyrn.* iii.

<sup>45</sup> II Pet. 3:16; cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* V. ix. 1.

<sup>46</sup> Justin, *Dial.* lxxx.

<sup>47</sup> Polycarp, *Ep.* vii; cf. Just. M., *On The Resurrection.*



cedent of the "firstfruits." A believer of the Pauline stamp would therefore have no thought of seeking the body of Jesus in the sepulcher after he had had the vision of the body which it pleased God to give him—the "body of glory." Such inquiry was probably known to be impracticable. It would have seemed at least unnecessary, if not impious. It would be as if the husbandman, after having reaped his "firstfruits," should seek again beneath the soil the seed he had placed there the season before. The Paulinist might expect to find, were such a needless inquiry to be made, either that the material body of the Lord had been "changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye"; or that it had suffered the normal fate of the "sinful flesh" to which it was "like." Neither alternative would affect the assurance on which he rested. To the believer of the post-apostolic age, who held a more concrete and materialistic type of doctrine, a doctrine of the *reanimation of the flesh*, investigation of the sepulcher would be the very first thought. To him it was incredible that some at least of the apostolic company should not have made it. To him almost any tale of a tomb found empty near Calvary within a brief time after the crucifixion would be credible and welcome. Through the preponderant influence of the Gospel of Mark the particular story which has become dominant in evangelic tradition is the shrine-story (to give it its true name) of the sepulcher of Joseph. It has indeed supplanted the older Petrine narrative in all but a few traces; but as we have seen, it bears the marks of its later origin upon its face. It has not been admitted without a struggle, the evidences of change and adaptation are everywhere. Relics of piecing, readjusting, and amending abound. Gradually the sepulcher traditions gain the upper hand over the Pauline. We can trace their steady advance from (Deutero-) Mark to Matthew, from these to Luke-Acts, from these to "John," to Ignatius, and to the *Gospel of Peter*. Mere manifestations of the risen Christ *in* Peter, or *in* Paul, no longer satisfy. It is not enough that God "energized in" Peter and ten other disciples in Galilee ten days or so after the crucifixion, or later (in Jerusalem?) in great "manifestations of the Spirit" to "James and all the apostles," and even to "above five hundred

brethren at once." Mere *spiritual* experiences like these could prove nothing on the great question, "With what *body* do they come?" There must be testimony that the sepulcher was empty, that the resurrection body was palpable, had "flesh and bones," that the disciples "ate and drank with him after that he rose from the dead." A decade after Paul's death it must have been already a hopeless task to resist the pressure of traditions of this type from which the gospel of Paul in I Cor., chap. 15, is still completely free. And down to our own time its main buttress is the supposed fact that the observance of Sunday commemorates the finding of the empty tomb.

(2) It is upon this supposed fact of the origin of Sunday observance in the discovery of the empty tomb that our inquiry into primitive differences between East and West may be expected to throw light. Preuschen, as we have seen, denies altogether the primitive observance of Sunday in the East; but this seems to be a misapprehension. The "resurrection" was otherwise commemorated, though it was believed to have happened on "the third day" (from the fatal Passover), and the first day of the week was observed as "the Lord's day," but without relation (primatively) to the sepulcher traditions. How came the "resurrection" to be dated (not without traces of vacillation) on "the third day," and all the West to make this "Lord's day" fundamental in its resurrection observance?

It is to be explained, unless we are misled, by the growing antipathy to the Jewish system of *annual* feasts and fasts, still observed in the time of Paul and the Travel document, and not only by the earlier apostles and the Palestinian churches but by Paul himself and the churches of Asia. Unlike the hebdomadal system, the annual system of Passover, Pentecost and "the Fast," could be kept only on the basis of the Jewish luni-solar year, the determination of which was an exclusive prerogative of the Jewish authorities. It is a marvel that such traces as still remain of this luni-solar system in our ecclesiastical year should have been able to maintain front against the Julian calendar. Before the end of the first century a new hebdomadal system was rapidly superseding the Jewish fasts and Sabbaths throughout the Christian

world. Everywhere "the Lord's day" was finding more observers than the seventh, though for a time both continued side by side, even at Rome.<sup>48</sup> But "fasting the world" and "sabbatizing (i.e., discontinuing) the Sabbath" were soon decreed to be conditions sine qua non of "inheriting the kingdom" and "beholding the Father."<sup>49</sup> The Gospel of Mark will have no more either of these or of Passovers. The weekly Lord's Supper was instituted according to this evangelist at the very time of the Passover feast, and for the express purpose of displacing it.<sup>50</sup> Western sentiment will have been at least equally hostile to the observance of Pentecost; whereas in the Orient the seven weeks of wheat-harvest continued to be among Christians as it had been among Jews, a period of uninterrupted festivity, commemorating, as it did, not merely "the joy of harvest," but the restoration of the "corn of wheat," the period when Jesus "ate and drank with the disciples, after that he was risen from the dead." We have only to go back to the "Travel-document" of Acts to find Paul and his company even more careful about the observance of Pentecost in Jerusalem, than of Passover at Philippi.

But in the West the system of Jewish *annual* feasts and fasts is violently repudiated. After Acts 27:9, we hear no more of "the (annual) Fast." When in its place the Easter fast and feast come in, especial pains are taken to avoid all appearance of dependence on, or imitation of, "the most hateful mob of the Jews . . . the slayers of the Lord."<sup>51</sup> The calendar is ultimately so arranged that there shall be the least possible degree of coincidence between Passover and Easter,<sup>52</sup> and none whatever between Pentecost (Sunday) and Ascension day, while in the East in 100-130 Christians were still celebrating "the eighth day" (Sunday) as that on which

<sup>48</sup> Rom. 14:5 f.

<sup>49</sup> *Oxyrhynchus Logia*, Log. ii.

<sup>50</sup> Mark 14:25. See comment in *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, *ad loc.*, and cf. Eusebius, *Pasch. Frags.* §7.

<sup>51</sup> See the references to Socrates, Sozomen, and Eusebius in Drummond, *Authorship*, etc., p. 463. Drummond justly observes that the only thing which was objected to as Jewish in Quartodeciman practice was the time fixed for the observance.

<sup>52</sup> The writer of the *Paschal Chronicle* admits that "the apostles handed it down to the churches to keep the fourteenth of the first lunar month," but adds as a reason for putting off the celebration till the following Sunday "that we may not feast with the Jews."

"Jesus both rose again from the dead, and having been manifested ascended also into the heavens."<sup>53</sup>

The hebdomadal system of Mark distinctly aims to displace the Jewish,<sup>54</sup> and for this purpose opposes both fasts and Sabbaths with an explicit claim that the new faith shall determine its own ordinances (Mark 2:18—3:6). The fasts "on the second and fifth days of the week" are reduced to a single fast "on that day on which the Bridegroom was taken away" (2:20).<sup>55</sup> The Jewish Sabbaths are repudiated. In due time the evangelist will bring in "the first day of the week" as a memorial of the resurrection (16:1 ff.). Here, then, is a system which, while still fundamentally hebdomadal, is intensely and intentionally anti-Judaistic. The single weekly fast and weekly feast are intended to supersede both the hebdomadal and the annual system of the Synagogue. Two data, and two only, it has retained, both from the hebdomadal system, making one commemorate the death, the other the resurrection, of the Lord. The fourth evangelist, on the contrary, abandons the Markan outline of the ministry for one that is fundamentally based on Jesus' observance of the system of annual "feasts of the Jews."

But a *weekly* celebration of the passion and resurrection cannot be accounted for as original, especially in view of the better attested *annual* commemoration of Asia. It can only be accounted for as an effort to give new and altered application to practices already too deeply rooted for eradication. That these ancient practices were of Jewish origin might almost go without saying. The fact that they are *weekly* observances is absolutely conclusive. The sabbatic system is distinctive of Judaism. How, then, did "the Lord's day," in Paul's time, still on equal terms with the Sabbath, come gradually to increase in relative importance until post-Reformation divines could imagine some apostolic decree formally substituting the first for the seventh day of the week in Mosaic commandment?

<sup>53</sup> *Ep. Barn.* xv. 9.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Eusebius, *On the Passover*, §7. Whereas the Jews killed the sheep of the Passover only once a year "we of the new covenant on each Lord's day celebrate our own Passover."

<sup>55</sup> Matthew characteristically alters *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* to the plural.

The place to look when seeking the occasion of change in the hebdomadal system is the law of the hebdomadal system itself, the law of the Feast of *Weeks*. The starting-point for the seven weeks of wheat-harvest is "the morrow after the Sabbath" of Passover, Paul's "third day" from the crucifixion. It is signalized, as already noted, by the offering of "firstfruits." The system is completed by the great Day of Pentecost, on the fiftieth day.

Now it is true that only Samaritans and other heretical sects interpreted "the morrow after the Sabbath" in Lev. 23:11 as fixing Firstfruits (and consequently Pentecost also) invariably on the first day of the week. Orthodox synagogue practice, it would seem, has always adopted Sivan 6 as Pentecost, counting 50 days from Nisan 16, whatever the day of the week. But not only is it apparent from a comparison of I Cor. 15:20 with the passages already cited from Clement of Alexandria and Epiphanius, that the point of coincidence aimed at by Paul in his reference to the resurrection "on the third day" was the offering of the "firstfruits" in the temple, and not the visit of the women to the sepulcher, but we are able now to establish on astronomical grounds that there is no year of Pilate's administration in which Nisan 15 can have fallen on a Friday.<sup>56</sup> This really removes the Synoptic date from consideration and establishes the Johannine tradition of the crucifixion as having occurred on the 14th. It follows that Firstfruits (Nisan 16th) *in that year* will have been a Sunday by *all* reckonings, whether orthodox or sectarian. Pentecost also fell upon a "first day of the week." If, then, we can point to any peculiarly significant and memorable event signaling to the primitive church this terminus ad quem of the seven weeks period we need not be at a loss for the determination of the terminus a quo on "the third day" even without a reference to the visit of the women to the sepulcher. The hebdomadal system would stand alongside the annual once Pentecost, its fiftieth day, were fixed on a given day of the week. If it was a "Lord's day" Firstfruits also was a "Lord's day," that "third day" on which "according to the Scriptures" Christ must rise from the dead.

<sup>56</sup> See J. K. Fotheringham on "Astronomical Evidence for the date of the Crucifixion" in *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, XII, 45 (October, 1910), 123. Professor Fotheringham kindly refers to my own attempts in this direction on p. 124: "I am pleased to find that Dr. Bacon's date, 30 A.D., April 7, is now confirmed astronomically."

But surely it is superfluous to ask whether the Day of Pentecost had been made memorable to the primitive Church by any peculiarly significant occurrence. Whether we identify the manifestation to "above five hundred brethren at once," which in Paul's summary follows that "to Cephas" and that "to the twelve," with the Lukan story of the church's endowment with the Spirit or not, this "first day of the week" at Pentecost had peculiar right to the name "the Lord's day" (*ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*); for Peter's exposition of the significance of the event, as Luke, with his characteristic rhetorical skill, reports it, is this: "God hath made this same Jesus whom ye crucified both Lord (*κύριον*) and Christ."

Pentecost was the birthday of the church. For centuries the phenomena whose origin it witnessed remained the supreme evidence to which the church pointed for its sanction, the "demonstration of the Spirit and of power." Luke and Paul are at one in resting their assurance of the message of resurrection and adoption upon the fact that God had "poured forth this which ye see and hear." Surely if the ancient oriental church shifted its two weekly fasts from the second and fifth to the fourth and sixth days of the week through the influence of the Passover tragedy, it would not be surprising that it should—not indeed displace the weekly festival of the Sabbath, but—add a "first day of the week" with more or less kindred observances.

Paul is our witness that so early as our First Corinthians the other terminus of the seven festal weeks of wheat harvest, "the third day," which in the year of the crucifixion had been coincident with Firstfruits, was already taken to coincide with Jesus' becoming the "Firstfruits of them that slept." He based the belief on Scripture, not on any reported experience of man or woman in the church. His "Scripture" may have been Hos. 6:2; it may have been Lev. 23:11 ff., or the two in combination. All we can know for certain is that the hebdomadal system had thus received baptism into the church, and that the great Lord's day, fifty days from the morrow after the Sabbath of the Passover of the Crucifixion, was its pivotal point.

Occidental opposition to the feasts and fasts of the Synagogue would do the rest. Suppression of the annual system of commemo-

ration would throw the whole burden upon the weekly, and Friday and Sunday would be correspondingly emphasized as *weekly* commemorations of the death and resurrection of Jesus, leading to the whole series of divergences from oriental practice, and (indirectly) from tradition as well. The manifestations related in the later documents combine with their heightened emphasis upon the physical tangibleness of the body, an exact dating upon "the first day of the week." These are the two distinctive marks of the later evangelic as against the Pauline tradition. The Pauline manifestations are not dated, either as to time or place; and they are not physical, but spiritual experiences.

One curious date remains embedded in synoptic narrative, but singularly out of joint with all its context. Acts 1:3 limits the period of Jesus' post-resurrection intercourse with his disciples not, as we should expect, to fifty, but to "*forty* days." We almost unavoidably think of Pentecost as the inferior limit; for there is no occurrence of any kind to mark an earlier day. But if Pentecost be the term originally in mind when the tradition of the 40 days of intercourse took form, from what occurrence were they reckoned? Clearly it can only be the manifestation to Cephas, the first of the series, nearly obliterated elsewhere, as we have seen, from the synoptic record, but certainly an element of primitive tradition, and certainly located in Galilee. *Forty* days before Pentecost, or ten days after "the morrow after the Sabbath" of the crucifixion, is a date exactly accordant with all that is required in the still remaining traces for the date of that fundamental experience in the history of the church, the "turning again" of Simon.

But our main contention is independent of this. However the Lukan datum of the 40 days be accounted for, it is apparent that the primitive system of *weekly* fasts and Lord's days in the apostolic church was not based upon our synoptic tradition of the resurrection. The true relation of the two is more nearly the reverse. The weekly hebdomadal system East and West was based upon the Jewish. In the East the deflection caused by a desire to commemorate the Passion and Resurrection was relatively slight,

a shifting of the semi-weekly fasts, and the addition of a "Lord's day" to the Sabbath. In the West a less mystical conception of the "resurrection," and a stronger antipathy to the Jewish system of annual feasts led to much greater divergence. The observances of the church were made at first exclusively hebdomadal. The single weekly fast and weekly feast were perhaps the *only* commemoration of the crucifixion and resurrection. The tradition took on a form corresponding to these ideas. When the effort at unification of observance was made which culminated in the great Council of Nicaea, Roman practice, exemplified in synoptic tradition, was combined as well as might be with Asiatic, exemplified in John. Harmonization of the written tradition still remains an unfinished if not a hopeless task. But comparison is instructive.